

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 and 15-32 were pending in the application and currently stand rejected. Claims 6, 7, 19, 24, and 26 are cancelled. Entry of the present amendment and further examination of the present application in view of the following remarks are hereby requested.

Interview

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended in the telephonic interview conducted on August 23, 2012. During the interview, the Examiner provided helpful suggestions for amendments that would place the claims in condition for allowance. Applicants appreciate the willingness of the Examiner to expedite allowance of the application. The Examiner agreed to reconsider the §103 rejection in view of the remarks and amendments submitted herein.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-12 and 15-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,987,508, hereinafter "Agraharam," US 2001/0039592, hereinafter "Carden," and US 6,788,769, hereinafter "Waites." Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this ground of rejection.

Applicants submit that Agraharam fails to teach or suggest at least:

verifying that the at least one phone number is a valid phone number, that the at least one phone number is not blocked, and that the at least one phone number is not locked; and providing a PIN for subsequent registration completion via a web interface

and

verifying that the entered source phone number is a valid phone number, that the entered source phone number is not blocked, and that the entered source phone number is not locked; and prompting for entry of a name associated with the request for the user-specific website and initiating a call back routine

as now recited in amended claim 1.

Agraharam is generally directed to providing e-mail connectivity on a telephone network (see Agraharam, Abstract). Agraharam, at column 6, lines 24-58 (cited by the Examiner in the Office Action), states that “[t]he IVR system detects the phone number of the calling party ... and verifies that the telephone number and the PIN match, and then activates the alias mechanism.” Agraharam thus discloses verifying a request for email aliasing using a PIN. However, Agraharam does not teach or suggest “verifying that the at least one phone number is a valid phone number, that the at least one phone number is not blocked, and that the at least one phone number is not locked,” “providing a PIN for subsequent registration completion via a web interface,” “verifying that the entered source phone number is a valid phone number, that the entered source phone number is not blocked, and that the entered source phone number is not locked,” and “prompting for entry of a name associated with the request for the user-specific website and initiating a call back routine” as recited in claim 1.

Carden does not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Agraharam. Carden (see Abstract and paragraph 20) merely discloses assigning a web address that includes a telephone number in the actual web address. Verification can also be performed:

48. This information may be used to verify that the applicant is the person or entity to whom the issuing phone company has assigned the selected phone number. Other methods for verifying that a phone number is registered only to the actual owner of that phone number may also be envisioned. Presently contemplated methods for ensuring that only the proper entity registers the phone number belonging to that entity include verifying ownership via a return phone call to the telephone number, providing a password to the number sought to be registered, restricting registration of a phone number to applicants who are actually accessing the server via the telephone line associated with the phone number for which registration is sought, or an e-mail communication or some other verifiable communication.

However, Carden does not teach or suggest “verifying that the at least one phone number is a valid phone number, that the at least one phone number is not blocked, and that the at least one phone number is not locked,” “providing a PIN for subsequent registration completion via a web

interface,” “verifying that the entered source phone number is a valid phone number, that the entered source phone number is not blocked, and that the entered source phone number is not locked,” and “prompting for entry of a name associated with the request for the user-specific website and initiating a call back routine” as recited in amended claim 1.

Waites does not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Agraharam and Carden. Waits describes signing up for a service using a phone number:

As shown, in step **202** the user of computer **112A** or telephony device **132** who desires an email address and/or web page host may contact the server **102** and sign up for a service. The user may provide his home telephone number, including area code and local telephone number. In one embodiment where the telephony device **132** is used for this purpose, the user's telephone **132** may provide caller ID information to the server **102**, and the server **102** may receive and use the caller ID information to obtain one or more of the user's name and telephone number. The user may provide other information to the server **102**, such as names of family members, etc.

However, Waites does not teach or suggest “verifying that the at least one phone number is a valid phone number, that the at least one phone number is not blocked, and that the at least one phone number is not locked,” “providing a PIN for subsequent registration completion via a web interface,” “verifying that the entered source phone number is a valid phone number, that the entered source phone number is not blocked, and that the entered source phone number is not locked,” and “prompting for entry of a name associated with the request for the user-specific website and initiating a call back routine” as recited in amended claim 1. Therefore, Agraharam, Carden, and Waites, separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least the aforementioned features of amended claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1, and claims 2-5 which depend on claim 1, is respectfully requested.

During the August 23 interview, the Examiner indicated that such an amendment appears to overcome the cited references and that the claims, pending further review, would be allowable. Each of independent claims 8, 15, 20, 25, and 29 recite similar features as claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8, 15, 20, 25, and 29, and claims 9-12, 16-18,

DOCKET NO.: **FC-0006
Application No.: 09/728,107
Office Action Dated: June 13, 2012

PATENT

21-23, 27-28, and 30-32, which depend on independent claims 8, 15, 20, 25, and 29, is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims. Should the examiner have any further suggestions for expediting the prosecution of the presently pending claims, the undersigned respectfully asks the examiner contact him at 206-903-2474.

Date: September 12, 2012

/Han Gim/
Han Gim
Registration No. 62,953

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439